

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 (all the independent claims) have been amended. Claims 1-11 remain in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.


Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Devore. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. The claims as amended should be patentably distinguishable over Devore.

The Office Action alleges that a sense transistor 18 illustrated in Fig. 1 of Devore corresponds to the monitor transistor of claim 1, and that sense transistors 38, 40, 42, 44 illustrated in Fig. 3 of Devore correspond to the recited plurality of transistors. Please note, however, the sense transistor 18 is illustrated separately from the sense transistors 38, 40, 42 and 44 (see Figs. 1 and 3). That is, Devore does not teach or suggest that the sense transistor 18 includes the sense transistors 38, 40, 42 and 44 connected in parallel.

In contrast, according to an aspect of the present invention, a monitor transistor (M11) includes plural transistors (Q1-Q4) connected in parallel. The claims have been amended to emphasize the distinction. Devore fails to disclose or suggest the monitor transistor of claim 1, which includes the recited plurality of transistors connected in parallel. Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1, or recite limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, claims 2-11 should be allowable along with claim 1 and for other reasons.

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,


By _____

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No. 33,082
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403
(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants